



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,897	06/30/2000	Christopher R. Kane	13531	2046

7590

05/20/2004

Richard L. Catania Esq.
Scully Scott Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/608,897

Applicant(s)

KANE, CHRISTOPHER R.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11, 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 8, 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 2/23/04.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are independent claims. The Applicant has added claims 13 and 14 in the case.
3. The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahn et al., USPN 6,360,236 in view of Ferrel et al., USPN 5,860,073 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph:

The claim is narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. *The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only.* See 7.34.15 *Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112* of the MPEP. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited. The limitation contains more than one sentence within the claim. Appropriate correction is required. For examination purposes the Examiner based the rejection on the first sentence of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moseley, Microsoft Office 97, Copyright 1997 in view of Young, Cascading Style Sheets in IE4, 10/15/97.

In reference to independent claim 1, Moseley teaches:

A web page having a heading selected in accordance with a predefined naming convention. The reference illustrates in Figure 7.1 a means of selecting page headings and automatically identifying section headings based on the section title. The reference further provides a computer program that, in response to a selection, automatically performs the reading of the title and the identifying of section names within a document. See Moseley, pages 135-136. The reference illustrates bold text and a highlighted text, which suggest the utilization of a style sheet that can be applied to any formatted document; however, the reference does not provide a method for providing a style sheet having pre-defined style attributes and altering those same predefined attributes. Young provides cascading style sheets for the addition and modification of style attributes to specific instances of HTML elements. The Examiner notes that (as presently claimed), Young teaches several examples of predefined style attributes and the modification of those style attributes based on rules, which allow for greater precision within a formatted document. Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the term **altering** does not provide the Examiner with an explicit description within the limitations of the claim. The Young reference describes the action of the changing the background color of all paragraphs within the document. See Young, pages 2-6.

Art Unit: 2178

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moseley and Young before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the document mapping methods taught by Moseley to include the cascading style sheet methods of Young, because it would have given the author the benefit of style sheets modifications, which offer greater flexibility and allows for greater precision within a formatted document.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Moseley teaches:

The reference states the clicking on any heading on the left and you will be moved to corresponding section in the text. See Moseley, page 137.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Moseley teaches:

A web page having a heading selected in accordance with a predefined naming convention. The reference illustrates in Figure 7.1 a means of selecting page headings and automatically identifying section headings based on the section title. The reference further provides a computer program that, in response to a selection, automatically performs the reading of the title and the identifying of section names within a document. See Moseley, pages 135-136. The reference illustrates bold text and a highlighted text, which suggest the utilization of a style sheet that can be applied to any formatted document.

In reference to claims 5-7, the limitations reflect the system used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-3, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

In reference to claims 9-11, the limitations reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-3, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 14, Moseley teaches:

A web page having a heading selected in accordance with a predefined naming convention. The reference illustrates in Figure 7.1 a means of selecting page headings and automatically identifying section headings based on the section title.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4, 8, 12, and 13, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chen et al.,	USPN 6,668,354	filed (01/05/99)
--------------	----------------	------------------

Fong et al.,	USPN 6,279,015	filed (12/23/97)
--------------	----------------	------------------

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER